DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 455 564 EA 031 087

AUTHOR	Peca, Kathy
TITLE	Critical Educational Administration: Research, Theory, and Practice.
PUB DATE	2000-11-00
NOTE	51p.
PUB TYPE	Information Analyses (070) -- Opinion Papers (120)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Administrative Change; *Administrator Education; *Critical Theory; Elementary Secondary Education; Social Influences

ABSTRACT

Critical theory methodology is used in this paper to explore the notion that the daily practice of school personnel embodies prevailing societal ideology. This ideology can be oppressive and restraining, and it is self-maintaining in that school personnel pass it on to their students, who then carry it with them into society. Ideological influences can be exposed through objective and subjective (empirical and case study) methodologies, allowing school personnel to change their awareness of the power bases in schools through the process of reflection and thus emancipate themselves from them. Educators have a unique role in such critique because they not only can change themselves but also can influence change in students and, thereby, influence such change in society. Critical educational administration theory provides a means whereby school leaders can understand and ultimately disentangle themselves from the various forces that impinge upon educational practice. Because of the inherent rationality of people, administrators and members of the school community would move toward being less restrained by the bonds of externally and internally imposed ideology. Under the critical perspective, the task of the school administrator in the school community is to establish a climate whereby reflection, critique, and open dialogue are possible. Contains 56 references. (RT)

EA

ED 455 564

CRITICAL EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION:

RESEARCH, THEORY, AND PRACTICE

by

Dr. Kathy Peca
Professor of Educational Administration
Eastern New Mexico University
Portales, New Mexico

November, 2000

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
K. Peca
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

EA 031087

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CRITICAL EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

RESEARCH, THEORY, AND PRACTICE

The role of educational administration from the critical perspective is to enable individuals within schools to become aware of the societal ideological restraints placed upon them and, through reflection by individuals or groups, become less controlled by these restraints. Thus, theory is not "a mere vehicle that becomes superfluous as soon as data are at hand" (Giroux, 1983, p. 17), but a vital, dynamic, and evolutionary motivator for action. Schools are considered to be objective entities engaged in ideological maintenance, but there exists no formal body of theory about schools because schools are composed of individual people and the tension between these individuals and the school is what provides the impetus for these individuals to engage in critique of oppression and thus become free from restraints.

Critical Educational Administration Research

Because critical theory assumes the existence of both objective and subjective knowledge of an objective and unordered reality, it incorporates the methodologies of both the objective and subjective perspectives--empiricism and case study. However, the critical theorist posits an inherent tension between objective and subjective knowledge which Horkheimer (as cited in Held, 1980) explained: "There is an ever present tension

between the object known and the object's actuality and development. Critical theory seeks to examine and assess this tension" (p. 180). Thus, critical theory methodology is the exposure of this difference between what is apparent and why this reality exists or occurs.

In the school setting, the critical theorist views the daily practices of school personnel as embodying the prevailing societal ideology. Such embodiment of ideology is self-maintaining because, as Mannheim (1968) clarified, school personnel pass this ideology on to their students: "The collective consciousness of certain groups obscures the real condition of society to itself and to others and thereby stabilizes it" (p. 36). In a broader perspective, critique of the schooling process must occur for the exposure of the social and economic roots of the schooling process itself and of the knowledge which is imparted through the schools.

Whether through objective or subjective methodologies on individual or group levels, such exposure must occur within the school setting in order for school personnel to become aware of the prevailing school ideology and of the relationship between internal school ideology and the external societal ideology. The means for this critique is through the exposure of the language which prevails within the school setting because, as Held (1980) proposed: "Every society reaches into the individual, but within the individual, it is translated into a language quite distinct from that of everyday life--the language of the unconscious" (p. 110). The exposure of this unconscious language, through empirical or

case study methodology, must be accomplished within schools, so that school personnel can become aware of the ideological influences upon their everyday words and actions.

Through empirical or case study methodology, ideological influences are exposed. The mere exposure of the underlying ideologies of school practice is not able to break the grip of the ideology on schooling but will assist school personnel to change their awareness of the power bases in schools through the process of reflection. Objective and subjective methodologies expose what is. Reflection of what is as opposed to what should be impels people to move toward the ideal due to people's inherent rationality. The dialectic is the basis for reflection. This is the goal of critical critique--to have people become free from the prevailing ideological pressures and thus be able more freely to make choices and act accordingly.

Giroux (1983) viewed educators as having a unique role in critique because they not only can change themselves but also can influence change in students and, thereby, influence such change in society: "Educators can begin to identify how ideologies become constituted and they can then identify and reconstruct social practices and process that break rather than continue existing forms of social and psychological domination" (p. 32). The reason for this unique relationship between education and society, according to Friere (1985), is because "the forces that mold education so that it is self-perpetuation would not allow education to work against them" (p. 170). Education is created by society and is influenced and influences the evolution of society. By changing themselves, educators can change society. Self-emancipation can lead to societal emancipation.

Under the critical perspective, no one formal method of research exists in the educational administration field. Empirical and case study methodology expose the reality of ideological constraints upon individual administrators, groups of administrators, and on the schools. This exposure would impel administrators to reflect on what exists and what should be through the dialectic process. Administrators would engage in a critique of administrative behavior by reflecting on specific actions and what external and internal constraints caused the actions. Because of the inherent rationality of people, administrators would be compelled to change their actions to the more ideal behaviors and, thus, become more emancipated from ideological restraints.

Critical Educational Administration Theory

Critical theory, while positing the existence of objective reality and subjective knowledge of reality, moves beyond both means of knowing to acknowledge the existing tension between the objective and subjective knowledge of reality. Reality is viewed as being in a constant state of change. Because of this change, laws are not sought by the critical theorist. Only specifics can be known. Theory is seen to be generated by the individual, by groups, and be society as a totality. Theory generation occurs when each of these categories engages in the reflection on the difference between reality and the appearance of reality. The goal of such theory generation is to motivate human action.

Schools are viewed by the critical theorist as created human structures which maintain current societal ideology. As such, schools continue the social and intellectual restraints which cause people to remain oppressed. As proponents of ideological

maintenance, schools participate in establishing "the constraints on truth-speaking practices which prevent the populace and theorists alike from exposing outrageous social conditions" (Fuhrman & Sizek, 1979-80, p. 39). While schools are seen as aligned with the oppressive status quo, Bressler (1963) perceived schools as having the potential to emancipate society:

> Social change can be controlled by the application of disciplined intelligence. . . . the educational process is the only alternative to stagnation or revolutionary violence. It is the duty of education to preside over gradualistic change toward a more perfect expression of the democratic tradition. (p. 8)

Schools are objective entities engaged in ideological maintenance, but there exists no body of theory about schools because schools are composed of individual people and the tension between these individuals and the school is what provides the impetus for these individuals to engage in critique of such oppression and thus become less restrained.

The role of educational administration theory from the critical perspective is to enable individuals within the schooling process to become aware of the societal ideological restraints placed upon them and, through reflection, become less controlled by these restraints. According to Lather (1986), reflection leads the administrator to emancipatory knowledge which "increases awareness of the contradictions hidden or distorted by everyday understandings, and in doing so it directs attention to the possibilities for social transformation inherent in the present configuration of social processes" (p. 259).

Reflection leads to emancipatory knowledge which enables administrators to function under less societal restraint.

For educational administrators, critical theory does not provide statements of how they should act. Instead, critical theory generates statements of specific instances of reality in schooling on which administrators then reflect. These statements of reality are evaluated and then incorporated into administrators' actions, if the statements are reflectively acceptable. Theory is generated by individuals engaged in the critique of reality and the resultant exposure of the inconsistencies between the real and the ideal. Under this perspective, each person is a theorist and the theory generated is personal and may or may not be accepted by others. Thus, there is not a specific body of educational administration theory from the critical perspective.

Critical educational administration theory provides a means whereby school leaders can understand and ultimately disentangle themselves from the external and internal forces which impinge upon educational practice. As Hoy (1994) clarified: "Critical theory attempts to raise peoples' consciousness about their living and working conditions through logic and debate, but in the process it relies on the generation and analysis of ideologies" (pp. 183-184). The mere understanding of these forces or ideologies is insufficient from the critical perspective. Understanding must lead to action. While critical theory would generate no body of formal theory regarding educational administration, there would exist a dynamic process of self-reflection which would result in the administrator becoming more self-determined.

Schools and Societal Ideology

Critical theorists posit schools as inherently influenced by societal values which directly impact the day-to-day actions of students, teachers, and administrators. Apple (1982) viewed the school "as a site where the state, economy, and culture are interrelated . . . ." (p. 30). These external forces defined public education in the past and present and seek to transform education in the future based on specific political values and social goals. Critical theorists expose these underlying values and goals so that educators can view current practices and proposed reforms in a broader societal perspective.

In 1982, Apple alerted educators to the increasing influence of big business on public education. His focus was on proposals for voucher plans and tax credits which would allow for school choice. Apple argued that private gain under the rhetoric of democracy and personal choice was being substituted for the public good.

In 1996, Apple explicated the current attempt to tie a good education to the American economy. He further explored the Rightist influence on education through national examinations, standards, and curriculum. By standardization of public education, the actions within a school are controlled at the national level in order to inculcate specific values and preclude other values from influencing education. In 1992, Giroux previously expanded on this relationship between the American economy and schools in his critique of Goals 2000 and educational testing.

Apple's (1996) major premise was that schools are being used as scapegoats for societal problems. In 1995, Apple and Beane elaborated on the negative societal influences on education:

> All around us, we can see the signs. Public schools are called on to educate all of our children, yet are simultaneously blamed for the social and economic disparities that severely detract from their chances of successfully doing so. Local decision making is glorified in political rhetoric at the same time that legislation is introduced to put in place national standards, a national curriculum, and national tests. Demands are made to emphasize critical thinking while censorship of school programs and materials increases. Census figures display growing cultural diversity while pressure is applied to keep the curriculum within the narrow boundaries of Western cultural tradition. The needs of business and industry are suddenly the preeminent goals of our educational system. Education in morality and ethics is reduced to a litany of behavior traits. Privileged groups seek to flee comprehensive, diverse public schools through vouchers, tax credits, "choice" plans, and exclusionary programs for their "gifted children. (p. 3)

Apple (1996) concluded that this intertwining of economic and educational issues is based on political gain:

> What are the reasons that educational restructuring is given so much importance in dealing with unemployment and underemployment? One reason is the

> government's need for legitimacy. It must be seen to be doing something about these problems. Reforming education is not only widely acceptable and relatively unthreatening, but just as crucially, its success or failure will not be obvious in the short term. (p. 88)

Government posits societal problems as stemming from schools and, therefore, the solutions are to be found in the schools; however, government neglects the origins of societal problems in society itself.

Ozman and Craver (1995) viewed schools as directly linked to the current economic and political ideology. By the public's insistence on control of schools and the school's role in preparing students for work:

> . . . schools produce workers by reproducing the conditions of the workplace. . . . the school has a dual function--it provides skills and knowledge that make workers more economically valuable, and it socializes people to existing economic structures by modeling the school after the workplace with its rules, lines of authority, and hierarchies. . . . the schools promote conformity to a set of authority relationships existing in the capitalistic economic system. (p. 340)

Likewise, Giroux in 1988 cautioned that schools and their purpose were becoming increasing tied to societal industrial and business interests:

> In the current political climate, there is little talk about schools and democracy and a great deal of debate about how schools might become more successful in meeting industrial needs and contributing to economic

> productivity. . .Unfortunately, at a time when we need a different language of analysis to understand the structure and meaning of schooling, Americans have retreated back into the discourse of management and administration, with its focus on issues of efficiency and control. (p. 1)

Schools embody the current economic and political ideology and through schools' ideological mechanisms, promote and provide for future citizens who will be prepared to continue the current economic and political ideology.

These examples of critical theorists' explications of ideological influences on public education are not for the purpose of pure rhetoric and public interest. School administrators must be proactive and not reactive to these influences. When confronted with the reality of the economic, religious, and political bases for current practices and proposed educational reforms, school administrators must realize the need to become major players in the political arena. Whether through national, state, or local organizations, administrators must speak out publicly and question those who seek to influence education for their own ends because, as Razik and Swanson (1993) clarified: "Critical theorists strive for an educational system that will influence society rather than permit society to dominate and control educational and other social institutions" (p. 558).

Ideology Within Schools

According to critical theorists, schools are one form of organization constructed by people which further distances individuals from understanding the reality of society as a totality and also contributes to people's alienated condition. Because schools are a product

of society, they reflect and embody the values which that society maintains. As such, schools continue to inculcate these values into the young members of society and, thus, serve as ideological maintenance institutions which perpetuate rather than change societal values.

Schools are viewed by critical theorists as created human structures which maintain current societal ideology. As proponents of ideological maintenance, schools participate in establishing "the constraints on truth-speaking practices which prevent the populace and theorists alike from exposing outrageous social conditions" (Fuhrman & Sizek, 1979-80, p. 39). While schools are seen as aligned with the oppressive status quo, Bressler (1963) perceived schools as having the potential to emancipate society:

> Social change can be controlled by the application of disciplined intelligence. . . . the educational process is the only alternative to stagnation or revolutionary violence. It is the duty of education to preside over gradualistic change toward a more perfect expression of the democratic tradition. (p. 8)

Under the critical perspective, schools are seen as continuing the social and intellectual restraints which cause people to remain oppressed.

In a more specific perspective, exposure must also occur within the school setting for school personnel to become aware of the prevailing school ideology which is the basis for educational decisions and actions. Bates (1982) argued that the role of actively exposing and analyzing the relationship between societal ideology and schooling is unique to school leadership because:

> Organizations are cultures rather than structures and it is the maintenance and contestation of what is to constitute the culture of organizational life that provides the dynamic of rationality, legitimation and motivation in organizations. This dynamic is the praxis of the administration. (p. 5)

Foster (1982) continued to elucidate this critical function of school administrators:

> A useful theory of educational administration, if such could be found, would serve to integrate research on the relationship between internal school and classroom events and external social structures, with a critical and dialectical appreciation of how one affects the other. (p. 15)

Schools are perceived not as isolated institutions but as functioning components of the society which create and maintain these social constructs in order to perpetuate prevailing social values. School leaders are the appropriate personnel to disclose the social and economic roots of the knowledge maximized in schooling. This awareness then can be utilized to understand the values and practices which exist within schools.

Critical theorists elaborate on the values and practices within schools which maintain the ideological perspective of schools. Topics such as curriculum, teaching, and student issues display the inherent social values in the schooling process.

In 1979, Apple contended that the school curriculum is inherently political:

> Knowledge that now gets into schools is already a choice from a much larger universe of possible social knowledge and principles. It is a form of cultural capital that comes from somewhere, that often reflects the perspectives and

> beliefs of powerful segments of our social collectivity. In its very production and dissemination as a public and economic commodity--as books, films, materials, and so forth--it is repeatedly filtered through ideological and economic commitments. (p. 8)

What is included in curriculum is not value-free but is a purposeful choice based on values which are often indiscernible but promoted as benefiting students.

Apple (1979) also perceived the actions of the educators within schools as maintaining specific ideological perspectives. These actions were deemed as "the hidden curriculum" or "the tacit teaching to students of norms, values, and dispositions that goes on simply by their living in and coping with the institutional expectations and routines of schools day in and day out for a number of years" (p. 14). Portelli (1993) viewed the formal curriculum as "that curriculum which is officially recognized. It is public, available to all who ask for it and it is meant to be explicit" (p. 343). The contrast between the formal, explicit curriculum and the hidden, implied curriculum is what constitutes the ideological perspective of schooling. The critical educator is to expose the dichotomy between the explicit and implicit curricula because, as Giroux (1988) indicated:

> Once the hidden curriculum becomes obvious, students and teachers will be more sensitive to recognizing and altering its worst effects and can work to build new structures, methods, and social relationships in which underlying classroom norms and values will work so as to promote learning rather than

adjustment. (p. 51)

Thus, students are exposed not only to academic knowledge which is based on external values of what students should know but also exposed to the routine actions of educators which define social relations and behaviors.

Critique of how the formal curriculum is developed also has been revealed by critical authors. Giroux and McLaren (1986) exposed the technocratic rationality apparent in the development and planning of curricula:

> The development of curricula is increasingly left to administrative experts or simply adopted from publishers , with few, if any, contributions from teachers who are expected to implement the new programs. In its most ideologically offensive form, this type of prepackaged curriculum is rationalized as teacher-proof and is designed to be applied to any classroom context regardless of the historical, cultural, and socioeconomic differences that characterize various schools and students. (p. 219)

In 1988, Giroux continued in his critique of pre-packaged curriculum: "The underlying rationale in many of these packages reserves for teachers the role of simply carrying out predetermined content and instructional procedures" (p. 124). Thus, curriculum is left in the hands of the experts of which teachers are not included.

Under the critical perspective, curriculum is viewed as having both formal and hidden content with the dichotomous nature of curriculum in need of exposure through

critique. Also, the national standardization of curriculum is critiqued as being so under the control of experts and publishers as to negate the autonomy of the classroom teacher.

The critical perspective of teaching is as a liberating not dominating action. The art of pedagogy, if not liberating, can become a means to manipulate students. Friere (1996) argued against what he called "narration education":

> Narration (with the teacher as narrator) leads the students to memorize mechanically the narrated content. Worse yet, it turns them into "containers," into "receptacles" to be "filled" by the teacher. The more completely she fills the receptacles, the better a teacher she is. The more meekly the receptacles permit themselves to be filled, the better students they are. (pp. 52-53)

Narration education leads to the alienation of students because the content has no meaning for the students but is merely a form of disconnected receptivity.

Narration education is a form of domination and manipulation in that students do not interact with the knowledge but are required just to receive the knowledge. However, according to Shor and Freire (1987), teaching is never neutral:

> No matter what a teacher's politics, each course points in a certain direction, towards some convictions about society and knowledge. The selection of materials, the organization of study, the relations of discourse, are all shaped around the teacher's convictions. It is very interesting because of the contradiction we deal with in liberating education. In the liberating moment,

> we must try to convince the students and on the other hand we must respect them, not impose ideas on them. (p. 33)

For the critical teacher, teaching is not an imposition of ideas and facts but a means to engage students in a discourse about ideas and facts. As Friere and Macedo (1987) clarified:

> Schools should never impose absolute certainties on students. They should stimulate the certainty of never being too certain, a method vital to critical pedagogy. Educators should also stimulate the possibilities of expression, the possibilities of subjectivity. They should challenge students to discourse about the world. Educators should never deny the importance of technology, but they ought not to reduce learning to a technological comprehension of the world. (pp. 57-58)

Thus, the opposite of manipulation and domination is not leaving the students to do as they please. The role of the teacher becomes one of directing serious study through reflection.

Critical pedagogy, as opposed to narrative education, encompasses an interaction between the student, teacher, and subject matter. This interaction is demonstrated through dialogue. "Dialogue is a moment where humans meet to reflect on their reality as they make and remake it" (Shor & Freire, 1987, p. 98). Dialogue in teaching is intrinsic to critical pedagogy because of critical theorists' focus on language as the means to expose conscious and unconscious perspectives. By the exposure through language, perspectives can change and language therefore changes. The only means a teacher has of discovery

such change is through student language. According to Shor and Freire, student language is intrinsic to critical pedagogy:

> Student silence is created by the arts of domination. Students are not silent by nature. They have a great deal to say, but not in the script of the traditional classroom. Reinventing the visual and verbal aspects of the classroom are two ways of addressing the destructive arts of passive education. Discovering a key student theme and then orchestrating it as a motif, variations on the theme to explore its character, is also an artistic use of dialogue. (p. 117)

Critical pedagogy is active pedagogy with both students and teachers engaging in dialogue in the classroom setting.

The teacher's role in critical pedagogy is that of an active participant with the students. "The teacher can say in advance, I know the material, I know the science of oceanography, or this novel by Zola, or this lathe in front of us, or even the hamburgers we eat in the cafeteria, but in the dialogical process, I relearn the material when I study it again with the students" (Shor & Freire, 1987, p. 100). However, while the teacher continues to learn while engaging in the dialogical process, the focus remains on the student dialogue. The teacher must understand student perspective and begin with that perspective because, as Freire (1985) indicated:

> Sometimes educators forget to recognize that no one gets from one side of the street to the other without crossing it! No one reaches the other side by

> starting from the same side. One can only reach the other side by starting from the opposite side. The level of my present knowledge is the other side to my students. I have to begin from the opposite side, that of the students. My knowledge is my reality, not theirs. So I have to begin from their reality to bring them to my reality. (p. 189)

Such ability to view teaching and learning from the student's perspective in order to bring them to the perspective of the teacher indicates a relationship between teacher and student which allows for free and open communication without fear and intimidation.

Under the critical perspective, the teacher, through the dialogical process, brings student awareness to a broader view of the political sphere of learning. Giroux (1988) termed a teacher who functions in this manner as a "transformative intellectual" in that teachers "use forms of pedagogy that treat students as critical agents; make knowledge problematic; utilize critical and affirming dialogue; and make the case for struggling for a qualitatively better world for all people" (p. 127). Dialogue for dialogue's sake is insufficient. The purpose of classroom dialogue is to engage students in critique of power relations and politics of a specific subject matter in order to transform the student's reflections on themselves and the world into a momentum for action. Rodriquez-Talavera (1993) clarified this relationship between dialogue and action: "Communication is not only the individual's most significant tool for understanding his/her world, but it is also the catalyst for transforming it" (p. 4). Within the classroom, change begins with dialogue and leads to action.

The critique of power relations and politics in the classroom reflects both student actions and societal actions. For critical theorists, a major focus for classroom dialogue should be upon the oppression and struggles of the disadvantaged and the oppressed. Giroux (1991) justified the need for such dialogue under the term "border pedagogy":

> In the postmodern age, the boundaries that once held back diversity, otherness, and difference, whether in domestic ghettos or through national borders policed by custom officials, have begun to break down. The Eurocentric center can no longer absorb or contain the culture of the other as something that is threatening or dangerous. (p. 26)

Border pedagogy acknowledges the multifaceted nature of society and the subordination of groups of peoples by those in power positions. Classroom dialogue must address those areas of oppression in personal and societal actions and language, but Giroux clarified that such dialogue must not be a patronizing "of understanding the Other, but a sense of how the self is implicated in the construction of Otherness" (p. 255). Mere dialogue in the classroom is insufficient, after dialogue must come a basis for changing personal and societal oppression of Others.

The suggested opportunity for classroom dialogue in the classroom about Otherness is through multicultural education. Trueba (1992) indicated that

> Multicultural education is not only the education of minority groups, but of all Americans to learn to respect and appreciate each group and their collective richness in languages, cultures, and traditions. Equally important,

> is the inculcation of the principle of responsibility of all citizens to treat all persons, regardless of their diverse background, with the same respect. (p. 98)

However, Snider (1996) cautioned that many activities under the auspices of multicultural education are superficial activities such as ethnic days, art displays or ethnic food in the cafeteria. Such efforts further marginalize groups by avoiding the examination of the structures of curriculum and schooling in which racism is embedded.

To be effective in having students understand the creation of Otherness by themselves and by societal institutions, a true dialogue about and critique of personal beliefs and societal oppression must occur. Giroux (1991) posited that multicultural education is about Otherness but neglects to question the dominating aspects of white culture. Open dialogue allows students' personal beliefs to surface and be critiqued.

> Negative consciousness has to surface, or be allowed to surface, or be provoked to surface, if the teacher is to get authentic information on the levels of student thought. Racist and sexist remarks have to be drawn out as legitimate objects of study, as authentic parts of student consciousness. How can you study anything kept quiet? (Shor & Freire, 1987, p. 183)

The mere exposure of student beliefs about Otherness and about societal oppression is the first step in the process toward change. Critical theory posits the rationality of human beings in that exposure of dichotomous behavior creates an impetus for movement toward more rational behavior. Dialogue about oppression will move students to seek ways to change the status quo.

Under the perspective of critical pedagogy, students are actively engaged in changing themselves and society through dialogue in the classroom. Brodkey & Fine (1991) termed such students as " informed political agents" (p. 118) in that students are intellectuals who need to confront personal and institutional oppressive practices on intellectual grounds. McLaren (1998) noted that not all students may engage in classroom critique in that some may be resistant:

> Teachers can do no better than to create agendas of possibility in their classrooms. Not every student will want to take part, but many will. . . . No emancipatory pedagogy will ever be built out of theories of behavior which view students as lazy, defiant, lacking in ambition, or genetically inferior. A much more penetrating solution is to try to understand the structures of mediation in the sociocultural world that for student resistance. (pp. 192-193)

Student resistance becomes a power issue which arises when school personnel seek to dominate and manipulate students. When domination and manipulation are exposed and open dialogue is the pedagogical process, then students can move beyond resistance to learning and critique.

Thus, to the critical theorist, schools perpetuate and inculcate predominant societal ideologies and values:

> As children learn to accept as natural the social distinctions schools both reinforce and teach between important and unimportant knowledge, between

> normality and deviance, between work and play, and the subtle ideological rules and norms that inhere in these distinctions, they also internalize visions of both the way institutions should be organized and their appropriate place in these institutions. (Apple, 1979, p. 142)

The mere exposure of the underlying ideologies of school practices and values is not able to break the grip of the ideology on schooling but will assist school personnel to change their awareness of the power bases in schools through the process of reflection. Internal change in awareness will lead to external change in action. This is the goal of critical critique--to have people become free from the prevailing ideological pressures and thus be more freely able to make choices and act accordingly.

The critique of the schools continues when the school administrator moves beyond the superficial actions of those engaged in education to the values, myths, and language which truly present the underlying ideology of schooling and perpetuate the behavior of school people. The role of the administrator is to discover the "why" of a situation.

Obvious overt human action is the laboratory for critique. Factual, descriptive behavior must be viewed in light of its underlying ideology because, as Foster (1980) indicated:

> Facts are embedded in a text of values, and if one looks at administration as the direction of resources to solve problems, then it should be clear that at the most basic level, problems are defined as such only because they conflict with certain values. (p. 498)

These values are perpetuated in schools through myths which guide the organizational life (Bates, 1982), and the understanding of this value system must encompass these myths. The Habermasian emphasis on the study of ordinary language communication further enables the administrator to become aware of the myths and the values which constitute the school's ideology.

The critical theorist posits the goal of theory to be the emancipation of the individual, social groups, and society as a totality. Schools are viewed as maintainers of societal ideology and school administration is defined by the reflective process of the individual administrator. The critical position generates no body of theory, only specific instances of reality.

Critical Educational Administration Practice

At first glance, school administrators appear to focus on action with little, if any, attention paid to theory. The school administrator seeks to complete the ever-increasingly varied and numerous tasks and to fulfill the multiplicity of roles demanded by internal and external constituencies. The word "theory" often conjures up a world of vague ideas debated by scholars in meaningless textbooks that do not assist the practitioner. If anything, theories seem to confuse the field of educational administration by attempting to impose so-called "ivory tower" concepts in the day-to-day activities of school leaders.

This assumed dichotomy between theory and practice has its foundation in the positivist paradigm's promise of ultimately attaining generalizable theories that would direct best practices through lists of what to do in specific situations based on scientific

research. However, this promise of linking educational theory and educational practice through positivism has not been fulfilled (Dalmage, 1990). Thus, theory has come to be considered as impractical with little or no meaning for the world of the practitioner.

Upon closer scrutiny, theory is the basis for all human action -- it is the why of behavior, even if the why is not termed "theory" by the practitioner. Carr and Kemmis (1986) explained:

> ...since educational practitioners must already have some understanding of what they are doing and an elaborate, if not explicit, set of beliefs about why their practices make sense, they must already possess some "theory" that serves to explain and direct their conduct. (p. 111)

Sergiovanni (1992) termed these underlying beliefs of practice as "mindscapes" and elaborated that when mindscapes fit the world of practice, then better practice will result.

A practice, then, is not a form of thoughtless behavior which is separate from theory and to which theory is applied. All practices have theory, acknowledged or not, embedded in them because all practice is the consequence of beliefs which are conscious or unconscious (Carr & Kemmis, 1986).

Therefore, the school administrator's behaviors are inspired by theories, and theories are intrinsic to practice. However, theories are not mere opinion based upon vague feelings of how to act. Theories provide substantive grounds for practice, otherwise, the actions of school leaders "would be seen as ad hoc, based on narrowly subjective opinion, or both" (Maddock, 1990, p. 290).

In 1990, The National Commission for the Principalship posited a change in perspective on educational administration practice and theory. The Commission viewed the old scientific paradigms as antiquated and of limited value to the improvement of educational leadership and called for a realignment of theory with practice by analyzing research directly in the life of the schools. This national request for a renewed view of the relationship between theory and practice is significant, because practitioners must realize that theory is embedded in practice and provides the why of behavior. To understand practice is to understand the underlying beliefs upon which that practice is based. School administrators must understand the whys of their leadership behavior in order to know themselves and adjust their beliefs and resulting behaviors when necessary.

But, leadership is not personal behavior which can be justified by some theory. Leadership is behavior based upon theory. As Sergiovanni (1992) clarified: "The heart of leadership has to do with what a person believes, values, dreams about, and is committed to -- the person's personal vision, to use a popular term" (p. 7). Thus, theory is not a set of concepts imposed upon behavior after behavior has occurred, but a person's beliefs which are the underlying causes of behavior.

Awareness of constraint by internal and external ideologies can only lead school administrators to a change in their practice of administration. As Denhardt (1981) proposed, the emphasis of administration moves from power and control to awareness of differing value systems:

The critical approach might suggest an alternative style of management, one

> aimed not merely at control but rather at assisting individuals in discovering and and pursuing their own developmental needs, even recognizing that these may sometimes be at odds with those of the dominant values of the bureaucracy. (p. 633)

By engaging in a critique of schools and of the underlying ideology of society perpetuated by the schools, administrators not only free themselves from the bonds of this ideology; but, resultingly, also seek to assist those subordinate to them to become likewise aware of and free themselves from these bonds.

Consistent with the assumptions of critical theory,one area of focus for the school administrator's critique would be the perpetuation of societal oppression of minorities within the school setting. The exposure of how students are dominated and manipulated in schools can lead to a change in school ideology and, thus, free school personnel from societal constraints. The role of the school administrator under the critical perspective is to encourage school personnel to engage in critique of minority student oppression in the school and, thereby, begin the process of changing school and, ultimately, societal ideology and action. Views on minority students are both personal and school ideologies. By enabling school personnel to expose their views on minority issues and minority students, the school administrator's actions can become a catalyst for school personnel to critique their personal ideologies.

According to Lomotey (1995):

> Historically, we have prepared educators to work with students who have

> White Anglo-Saxon Protestant male values. Moreover, often when educators are exposed to children with dissimilar values, they do not know how to deal with these children. The result is isolation (in the back of the room), referrals to the principal's office (for subsequent suspension or expulsion and recommending for special education), or some other form of removal from the class. (p. 297)

Educators, under the critical perspective, are not beyond or above societal influences but are part of society and should strive to expose and change their perspectives on and actions toward minority students so as to be open to the perspectives of all students.

One such dominated group of students are African-Americans. "The underachievement of African-American students in public schools has been persistent, pervasive, and disproportionate" (Lomotey, 1990, p. 2). Because public schools have been and continue to be dominated by white culture, Lomotey (1993) viewed the underachievement of African-American students as based on oppressive educational experiences encountered in schools:

> Presently, many of these students see little connection between their educational experiences and their later lives. Moreover, they are not developing a commitment to the development of their own communities. Only with a greater emphasis from school leaders (teachers and administrators) on education for African-American students will we begin to see a qualitative change in the life chances of African-American peoples.

(p. 411))

By the exposure of the dichotomy between the educational experiences of the white students and the African-American students, the tension between these experiences becomes apparent and educators can then move toward relieving this tension.

Educators also must come to know and understand the African-American culture in order to know and understand their African-American students. Lomotey (1993) found that African-American principals had a cultural affinity toward African-American students which assisted these principals in their concern for student grades and life chances. Such cultural affinity is a prerequisite for all school administrators, according to Hale-Benson (1990), if black children are to have equal educational opportunity.

Gender discrimination is another area which must be critiqued in schools at the level of school personnel and at the level of students. Lather (1992) concluded that gender is central to understanding the distribution of power:

> Feminism argues the centrality of gender in the shaping of our consciousness, skills, and institutions as well as in the distribution of power and privilege. This is not to deny the powerful shaping forces of race, class, and sexual orientation; increasingly, feminist inquiry looks to the interaction of such social forces in the construction of our lives. (p. 91)

Power distribution is unequal in society and, thus, in educational settings. Marshall and Anderson (1994) argued that educational politics is embedded with male domination of

institutions and thought. The exposure of this domination is intrinsic to the critical movement toward freedom by both males and females.

School personnel bring their personal ideologies related to gender with them into the school setting. According to Shakeshaft, Nowell, and Perry (1991):

> Being born female or male does not in itself affect how we will act as workers; however, the way we are treated from birth onward, because we are either female or male, does help to determine how we both see and navigate the world. (p. 134)

Individuals cannot split apart their views and actions regarding gender. Ideologies pervade actions in and out of school.

Administrative behavior is enmeshed consistently in gender issues and affects how both male and female administrators function as administrators. Shakeshaft, Nowell, and Perry (1991) found that the sex of the supervisor and the teacher affects what is communicated and how the message is communicated and received. In a supervisory situation, men and women say and hear messages differently. Shakeshaft (1992) discovered that women administrators report at least one incident of unwanted sexual advancement by male colleagues and board members, that women administrators confirm that the more contact they have with men, the more likely they are to experience sexual behavior, and that male administrators did not want to work closely with women because they constitute a sexual threat.

Shakeshaft (1992) also found that sexuality within schools "exists and is tolerated, if not encouraged" (p. 17). Toleration of sexual behaviors, in male dominated schools, occurs not only with school personnel but also with students. According to Shakeshaft, peer sexual harassment is usually viewed by school personnel as normal interactions between children and teenagers. The personal ideology of school regarding sexuality and gender leads to actions reflective of this personal ideology.

In order to expose such sexual behaviors in schools, school personnel and administrators should engage in open dialogue about these matters. Shakeshaft, Nowell, and Perry (1991) described this form of dialogue:

> We might first examine ourselves. Having been raised in a sexist society, it is not surprising that we have ideas about what women and men can do and be, how males and females act, and how to treat men and women. We need to acknowledge our backgrounds and training, understanding that we had no control over what we were taught by society, school, and family. We do, however, have control over our actions today. (p. 138)

This dialogue can provide a basis for change of school personnel ideology and actions towards each other and towards students.

Related to the power issues of sexuality and feminism in schools is the issue of sexual orientation. Ormiston (1996) concluded that:

> The oppressions of homosexuals and women in our society are structured mechanisms essential to maintaining a system of gender inequity. Perverse

> as it is, homosexuals and women are valued for being objects, in aversion to which the dominant culture defines itself. This is one explanation for the double messages that many oppressed groups receive, such as praise bestowed upon women exhibiting the very qualities for which they are objectified. (p. 201)

Athanases (1996) argued that a strong school program in diversity must include sexual orientation and homophobia because it will "deepen students' understanding about identities and oppression and the ways in which marginal groups both share features and differ" (p. 254). The marginal and minority groups within the school setting, whether they are school personnel or students, must have an equal voice in open dialogue in a non-power-oriented atmosphere which can be accomplished only by exposing the ideologies which maintain power relationships.

Another area for educational dialogue is the issue of labelling students. Apple (1996) critiqued schools for labeling students as behavioral, emotional, or educational problems. He argued that ". . . the difficulties students and teachers face are perceived by and described as existing within and caused primarily by 'deficits' or 'diseases' in the students themselves" (p. 69). Apple viewed the causation of student problems not as school issues but as societal issues. If student problems are viewed as school issues, then society can place the blame for and resolution of these problems within the school. Society then can be seen as responsive to but not responsible for school problems.

Schools reflect society and, as such, are to make a concerted effort to change the oppressive and dominating influences of societal and personal ideologies within the school

in order to ultimately change society. The role of the school administrator is to facilitate and lead a dialogue about oppressive ideologies and the issues of power and manipulation. The administrators with power over school personnel and the teachers with power over students must understand that:

> Disadvantage cannot exist without ideologically established privilege. . . . The people benefiting from privilege are the ones who define societal norms, thus creating divisions of difference. Applying language as a tool of domination, the powerful reinforce their own advantage, thus marginalizing the identity of others. (Ormiston, 1996, p. 199)

Open dialogue in schools at both the adult and classroom levels about power related to minority, feminist, gay, and labeling issues can begin to change personal and school ideologies. Before actions can change, ideologies must change.

Thus, through exposure of dichotomous personal and school ideologies, according to Carr (1980), the school administrator moves toward the ultimate goal of critical theory which is emancipation:

> A basic feature of critical educational theory is that it seeks to emancipate practitioners from their dependence on practices that are the product of precedent, habit and tradition by developing modes of analysis and inquiry that are aimed at exposing and examining the beliefs, values and assumptions implicit in the theoretical framework through which practitioners organize their experiences. (p. 66)

The tasks of the school administrator are to expose the influence of societal ideology on the school's ideology, to assist members of the school community to become aware of their own ideological influences, and to engage in personal dialectic to understand the ideological influences on personal administrative behavior.

Critical School Leadership

Leadership moves beyond management of things and people to a focus on vision and ideas with the ultimate goal of emancipation. By freeing themselves and members of the school community from repressive ideologies, school leaders develop a personal vision as well as lead others to develop a vision of education which will result in action and, ultimately, change. As Hoy (1994) clarified: "The role of educational leaders is to create effective symbols that transform the existing social order into a truly democratic society" (p. 186).

The source of the school leader's personal vision is self-reflection which leads to self-knowledge. As Osterman (1990) proposed:

> Reflection is concentration and careful consideration, and reflective practice is the mindful consideration of one's actions, specifically, one's professional actions. This reflective practice, however, is far more than leisurely speculation on one's own successes and failures, and far more than the pursuit of knowledge for its own sake. Rather, reflective practice is a challenging, focused, and critical assessment of one's own behavior as a means towards developing one's own craftsmanship. While reflection is

> certainly essential to the process, reflective practice is a dialectic process in which thought is integrally linked with action. (p. 134)

The task of self-reflection is generated by a problem, a discrepancy between what occurred and what was expected or between the real and the ideal. School leaders step back and examine their actions and the reasons for their actions. They use this new perception as a means of developing alternative strategies and, thus, take an active role in shaping their personal professional growth (Osterman, 1990).

Whether through personal journals (Cooper & Heck, 1992) or contemplation, critical school leaders engage in the dialectic process in order to understand the discrepancies which occur in professional actions. Critical school leaders are skeptical and questioning of personal ideas and actions because they ". . . recognize the partiality of our own views in order to render them more suspect and open ended. . . ." (Giroux, 1992, p. 16).

However, the goal of self-reflection is not just to understand personal actions and ideas; the goal is to change actions and ideas when deemed necessary. "Reflection combined with personal vision and an internal system of values, becomes the basis of leadership strategies and actions" (Sergiovanni, 1992, p. 7). Osterman (1990) elaborated on this relationship between self-reflection and action:

> Reflective practice assumes that two elements are necessary if individuals are to bring about change: reflection and agency. Through reflection, professionals develop ideas about how to do things more effectively, and

> they transform these ideas into action. Whether or not change occurs depends on whether or not people have ideas, and on whether or not they experience a sense of agency or personal causality that enables them to become actively involved in the change process and to introduce new strategies within the classroom, the school, the district, or the community. (p. 145)

Thus, critical school leaders define and change their visions and actions through self-reflection.

However, personal vision and action must be viewed in light of the totality known as a school because the critical perspective provides a view of organizations as groups of people united in common purpose. This common purpose provides a sense of community whereby all involved engage in activities which emancipate individuals as well as the community as a whole. Sergiovanni (1992) described such a school community:

> How should schools be understood as learning communities? Communities are defined by their centers--repositories of values, sentiments, and beliefs that provide the needed cement for bonding people together in a common cause. Centers govern what is valuable to a community. They provide norms that guide behavior and give meaning to community life. (p. 47)

The critical perspective presents language as the most prominent social means of reifying ideology in any organization. Thus, the focus of school leaders should be on the language regarding schools used by society, by members of the school community, and by the administrator personally.

Language is the means whereby the myths and values which are subconsciously adhered to are translated into overt representations. The exposure of this underlying ideology occurs when individuals are provided with the impetus and means to reflect on what has occurred and then engage in open dialogue about these perceptions. Bernstein (1976) termed such discourse by school personnel as a "free, unconstrained community of inquirers" (p. 214). Thus, the administrator is not viewed as one who has more power, but as one who provides the setting and climate for all members of the school community, including the administrator, to engage in open dialogue as equals in order to expose the underlying influences on school personnel behavior.

Such exposure must result in more than mere knowledge. The exposure of underlying influences on school personnel must result in a change of perceptions which is made apparent through a change in language and action. Action should be based on personal choice and become more emancipated from ideological influences. This more freely situated behavior is termed by Habermas (as cited in Bernstein, 1976) as strategic action in that it depends upon correct evaluation of alternative choices which result from calculation supplemented by values and not from calculation based on control.

Dialogue in a school community must be free of all vestiges of power and authority. School leaders must allow for unfettered expression because as O'Neill (as cited in Forester, 1985) clarified:

> Dialogue cannot grow where men or women are arrogant and domineering; it can be sustained only in humility. Such humility cannot be present where a

> few people consider themselves wise and the rest ignorant or when men and women set themselves apart and unwillingly bend in the service of others. (p. 68)

This dialogue must not be constrained by traditional authoritarian concepts. All members of the school community, including students, must participate because, as O'Neill (as cited in Forester, 1985) contended: "Wherever some men or women presume to speak for others, they make the world less human" (p. 67). This role by students in critical dialogue was elucidated by Apple (1979):

> It might be wise to consider engaging students in the articulation and development of paradigms of activity within their everyday lives at school. Such involvement could enable students to come to grips with and amplify crucial insights into their own conditionedness and freedom. (p. 101)

Thus, all members of the school community should engage in free and unrestrained dialogue in order to free this community from the repression of ideology held by members of the community.

Consistent critique in the school setting results in no generalized, abstract behaviors for school leaders to demonstrate. Generalized behaviors are viewed as imposed by societal ideology and are thus to be critiqued by the administrator. School communities which engage in critique are dynamic and evolutionary with change as an intrinsic component. Tuthill and Ashton (1983) described the climate of such a community:

> Educational communities must ensure that their truths are constantly open

> to review and scrutiny by all those who may be affected by these truths, and they must ensure that when decisions are made, that evidence is drawn from as wide a variety of sources as possible. Educational communities must also make sure that decisions are made objectively and that these decisions are subjected to constant review, reanalysis, and change. (p. 13)

The resultant actions from critical dialogue in the school community should be empowering to all members of the community. Critical school leadership encourages open dialogue in all aspects of education, most especially, in the area of decision making in which reflection and dialogue make apparent the changes in values and actions.

Clark (as cited in Deakin, 1985) viewed administrative decision making as the formalized expression of community or non-community in a school:

> It is quite clear that how decisions are arrived at largely reflects the ideological stances of those in administrative power. Whether to be agents of social change or social control, whether to perpetuate or eliminate economic and political domination and oppression--these are the crucial issues facing educational administrators as they go about their daily task of deciding what goes on in their schools. (p. 30)

Because of multiple responsibilities, school leaders often make decisions in haste in order to expedite action and, consequently, critical issues and perspectives are neglected. "Decisions are often made too quickly, only to be regretted later on when forces are set in

motion that could have been avoided if the implications of one's actions had been thought through more fully" (Apple, 1988, p. 306).

Critical school leaders who view schools as learning communities do not impose expedient decisions on subordinates but encourage and engage in open dialogue in order to reach the most satisfying conclusion. "The consideration of competing claims must be within a context of free, undistorted and non-coercive communication where the interests of the various parties are understood, and where decisions embody the good of all members, and not just the interests of administrative decision makers" (Clarke as cited in Deakin, 1985, p. 28).

The leader of a school community engages in open dialogue because the members of the community are viewed as equals who share the vision and values of the community. If the school is a community, then the members of the school equally define the community. The result is true democracy and the liberation of all members from the constraints of personal and societal ideologies. According to Lutz (1992), organizational decisions should begin with the people who do the work and, while administrators still have input into decisions, the workers are the source of most initiatives and the source of the majority of power. In such a school community, all members can be emancipated because this is the ultimate goal of the actions of a critical school administrator.

The current reform movement in public education is based on the premise that changing policy will lead to change in practice. Externally imposed changes will not change what occurs behind closed classroom doors. In order to change education and not

the forms of education, intrinsic not superficial transformation must be sought. Sarason (1990) contended that there has been a surfeit of band-aid reforms at a time when education is systemically unsound. To truly reform schools, the ideologically based issues in society and within schools which maintain the status quo and resist change must be exposed. Thus, critical theory's application to education becomes crucial, if school reform is to come to pass.

Critical educators understand that educational problems are really societal problems which can never be solved solely within schools. Schools maintain and reflect the ideologies of society and for school problems to be resolved, societal problems first must be exposed and solved. Critical educators are aware of the interrelatedness between schools and society and, according to Razik and Swanson (1993), critical educators ". . . strive for an educational system that will influence society rather than permit society to dominate and control educational and other social institutions" (p. 558).

However, critical educators also acknowledge that reform must occur within schools by exposing the underlying ideologies which are the bases for school behaviors. These behaviors are caused by power struggles which control all members of the school community. The exposure and ultimate change of these power-based associations are pivotal because, as Sarason (1990) indicated: "Ignore these relationships, leave unexamined their rationale, and the existing 'system' will defeat efforts at reform" (p. 7). Critical educators affirm that the narrow perspectives of individuals in schools must be

eradicated through collaborative dialogue in order to break down adversarial relationships and begin to work together as a true school community.

Critical school administrators believe that school reform can occur and that societal and personal changes can take place. Through reflection and dialogue, underlying ideologies which contribute to and maintain the status quo can be exposed so that school reform can focus on fundamental and not on superficial issues. Critical school administrators do not dwell on problems but are optimistic that reflection and dialogue will result in educational change. Giroux (1992) summarized this critical perspective of school administration: "This is leadership that dreams in order to change the world rather than manage it" (p. 19).

The critical perspective posits school administrative behavior to be defined uniquely by the perceptions of the individual administrator as well as by the social consensus of the school community. The primary task for the administrator is to provide an appropriate climate within the school setting so that all members of the school community can engage in critique and open discourse in order to move toward lessening the restraints of objective and subjective ideological influences.

Overview

Critical school administration research, theory, and practice are based on the following assumptions:

1. Objective and subjective methodologies (empiricism and case study) are used to expose the current conditions of objective and subjective realities.

2. Through critique, the tension between existing and ideal administrative behavior is exposed and compelled toward the ideal.

3. Schools are maintainers of societal ideology.

4. The goal of theory is emancipation from externally and internally imposed constraints on administrative behavior.

5. Practice is unique to each school administrator and school community.

6. Schools are not inherently ordered, but there is movement toward more rational behavior by the administrator and by members of the school community.

7. Conflict is resolved by providing a climate of open discourse.

8. Focus is on ideological influences on education and behavior discovered through language used by administrator and school community.

Under the critical theory perspective of educational administration, reality is assumed to be in a constant state of change with reality evolving toward a state of order. For the educational administrator, this evolution is toward more rational human behavior which was defined by Habermas (as cited in Held, 1980) as the "capacity to be self-reflective and self-determined" (p. 218). In order to achieve more rational behavior, the administrator must become less constrained by personal, social, and societal ideologies.

The focus of critical research is on the inherent tension between the ideologies of the individual administrator, members of the school community, and society as a totality of which the school is a reflection. To alleviate this tension, the reality of ideological influence is exposed through both objective and subjective methodologies--empiricism and

case study. Each member of the school community, as an individual and as a member of the community, alleviates this tension by engaging in reflection on this tension, and, through the dialectic, critiques the differences between the real and ideal.

Because of the inherent rationality of people, the individual administrator and members of the school community will move toward being less restrained by the bonds of externally and internally imposed ideology. This form of theory derivation does not provide direction for administrative behavior, but does provide a motivation for more emancipated administrative behavior. Under the critical perspective, the task of the school administrator in the school community is to establish a climate whereby reflection, critique, and open dialogue are possible.

REFERENCES

Apple, M. W. (1979). Ideology and curriculum. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Apple, M. W. (1982). Education and power. Boston: Ark Paperbacks.

Apple, M. W. (1988). Teaching and technology: The hidden effects of computers on teachers and students. In L. E. Beyer (Ed.), The curriculum: Problems, politics, and possibilities (pp. 289-311). Albany: State University of New York Press.

Apple, M. W. (1996). Cultural politics and education. Teachers College: Columbia University.

Apple, M. W., & J. A. Beane. (1995). Democratic schools. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Athanases, S. Z. (1996). A gay-themed lesson in an ethnic literature curriculum: Tenth graders' response to 'Dear Anita'. Harvard Educational Review, 66(2), 231-156.

Bates, R. (1982). Towards a critical practice of educational administration. Studies in Educational Administration , (27), 1-15.

Bernstein, R. J. (1976). The restructuring of social and political theory. New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich.

Bressler, M. (1963). The convenient wisdom of education and sociology. In C. H. Page (ed.), Sociology and contemporary education. New York: Random House.

Brodkey, L., & M. Fine. (1991). Presence of mind in the absence of body. In Giroux, H. A. (Ed.). Postmodernism, Feminism, and Cultural Politics. New York: State University of New York Press.

Carr, W. (1980). The gap between theory and practice. Journal of Further and Higher Education, 4(1), 60-69.

Carr, W., & Kemmis, S. (1986). Becoming critical. London: The Falmer Press.

Cooper, J. E., & Heck, R. H. (1992). Principal leadership and problem solving: Using journals to examine cognitive practices of school principals. Unpublished paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, California.

Dalmage, W. R. (August, 1992). The quest for understanding in educational administration: A Habermasian perspective on the 'Griffiths-Greenfield Debate'. The Journal of Educational Thought, 26(2), 89-113.

Deakin University Press (ed.). (1985). Critical practice in educational administration. Victoria, Australia: Deakin University.

Denhardt, R. B. (1981). Toward a critical theory of public organization. Public Administration Review, 41(6), 628-635.

Forester, J. (ed.). (1985). Critical theory and public life. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Foster, W. P. (1980). Administration and the crisis in legitimacy: A review of Habermasian thought. Harvard Educational Review, 50, 496-505.

Foster, W. P. (1982). Toward a critical theory of educational administration. Unpublished paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York City.

Freire, P. (1985). The politics of education. Massachusetts: Bergin & Garvey Publishers, Inc.

Freire, P. (1996). Pedagogy of the oppressed. New York: The Continuum Publishing Company.

Freire, P., & Macedo, D. (1987). Literacy reading the word and the world. Massachusetts: Bergin & Garvey Publishers, Inc.

Fuhrman, E. & Sizek, W. E. (1979-80). Some observations on the nature and content of critical theory. Humboldt Journal of Social Relations, 7(1), 33-51.

Giroux, H. (1983). Critical theory and educational practice. Victoria, Australia: Deakin University.

Giroux, H. (1988). Teachers as intellectuals. New York: Bergin & Garvey Publishers, Inc.

Giroux, H. (1991). Postmodernism, feminism, and cultural politics. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Giroux, H. (1992). Educational leadership and the crisis of democratic culture. University Park, PA: University Council of Educational Administration.

Giroux, H. A., & McLaren, P. (1986). Teacher education and the politics of engagement: The case for democratic schooling. Harvard Educational Review, 56(3), 213-238.

Hale-Benson, J. (1990). Visions for children: Educating black children in the context of their culture. In Lomotey, K. (Ed.). Going to School: The African-American Experience. New York: State University of New York Press.

Held, D. (1980). Introduction to critical theory. London: Hutchinson and Co., Ltd.

Hoy, W. K. (1994). Foundations of educational administration: Traditional and emerging perspectives. Educational Administration Quarterly, 30, 178-198.

Lather, P. (1986). Research as praxis. Harvard Educational Review, 56(3), 257-277.

Lather, P. (1992). Critical frames in educational research: Feminist and post-structural perspectives. Theory Into Practice, 31(2), 87-99.

Lomotey, K. (1990). Going to school: The African-American experience. New York: State University of New York Press.

Lomotey, K. (1993). African-American principals: Bureaucrat/administrators and ethno-humanists. Urban Education, 27(4), 395-412.

Lomotey, K. (1995). Social and cultural influences on schooling: A commentary on the UCEA Knowledge Base Project, Domain I. Educational Administration Quarterly, 31(2), 294-303.

Lutz, F. W. (1992). The courage to be creative. Journal of School Leadership, 2(4), 456-469.

Maddock, T. (August, 1990). The relevance of philosophy to educational administration. Educational Administration Quarterly, 26, 280-292.

Mannheim, K. (1968). Ideology and utopia. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc.

Marshall, C., & G. Anderson. (1994). Rethinking the public and private spheres: Feminist and cultural studies perspectives on the politics of education. Journal of Educational Policy, 9(5 & 6)), 169-182.

McLaren, P. (1998). Life in schools. New York: Longman.

National Commission for the Principalship. (1990). Principals for our changing schools. Fairfax, Virginia: National Commission for the Principalship

Ormiston, W. (1996). Stone Butch celebration: A transgender-inspired revolution in academia. Harvard Educational Review, 66(2), 198-215.

Osterman, K. F. (1990). Reflective practice a new agenda for education. Education and Urban Society, 22, 133-152.

Ozman, H. A. & Craver, S. M. (1995). Philosophical foundations of education. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Merrill.

Portelli, J. P. (1993). Exposing the hidden curriculum. Journal of Curriculum Studies, 25(4), 343-358.

Razik, T. A., & Swanson, A. D. (1995). Fundamental concepts of educational leadership and management. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Merrill.

Rodriguez-Talavera, L. (1993). A semiotic interpretation of the teaching of business communication in today's global economic trend. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Business Communication, Montreal.

Sarason, S. B. (1990). The predictable failure of educational reform. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Sergiovanni, T. J. (1992). Moral leadership. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Shakeshaft, C. (1992). Deconstructing the erected hierarchy: Sex and power in organizations. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, San Francisco.

Shakeshaft, C., I. Nowell, & A. Perry. (1991). Gender and supervision. Theory Into Practice, 30(2), 134-139.

Shor, I., & Freire, P. (1987). A pedagogy for liberation. New York: Bergin & Garvey.

Snider, K. (1996). Race and sexual orientation: The (im)possibility of these intersections in educational policy. Harvard Educational Review, 66(2), 294-302.

Trueba, H. T. (1992). Many groups, one people: The meaning and significance of multicultural education in modern America. Bilingual Research Journal, 16 (3-4), 91-116.

Tuthill, D., & Ashton, P. (1983). Improving educational research through the development of educational paradigms. Educational Researcher, 12(10), 6-14.